



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/639,196	08/15/2000	Arto Palin	08212/0200342-US0	1563
38879	7590	02/17/2006	EXAMINER	
DARBY & DARBY P.C. P.O. BOX 5257 NEW YORK, NY 10150-6257			NGUYEN, HAU H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2676	

DATE MAILED: 02/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/639,196

Applicant(s)

PALIN, ARTO

Examiner

Hau H. Nguyen

Art Unit

2676

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,4,10,13,19,20,22,23 and 30 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-9,11,12,14-18,21,24-29 and 31-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Wergeland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,792,148).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language:

3. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 14-16, 25-29, 32-33, 35, and 36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wergeland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,792,148).

Referring to claims 1, 16, 28, 35, and 36, as shown in Fig. 2, Wergeland et al. teach a mobile terminal 200, having a display 230, coupled to receive graphical data from a camera 100 via an RF link at the interface 240 (a receiver). Data received can be displayed on the display 230, or transferred in a compressed form over air interface 250 or interface 260 to another mobile for display or another system for display. The interface 260 includes a wireless connection such as RF link (a transmitter) (col. 5, lines 24-42, see also Fig. 3). Wergeland et al. also teach the captured frames and the compressed frames may be transferred to the wireless mobile terminal over the image data interface such that, for example, compressed image frames

Art Unit: 2676

(second data format) may be transferred further over an air interface while captured image frames (first data format) may be displayed locally on the display associated with the mobile terminal (col. 3, lines 36-47). Thus, it is implied that a means for splitting the first and second data is included to provide graphical data in the first format to the display of the mobile terminal, and provide graphical data in the second format to an external display over the air interface.

In regard to claim 2, 5, 29, 32, 33, as cited above, Wergeland et al. teach interface 260 may a wireless connection such as, for example, an infrared link, an RF link, a piconet link, a Bluetooth link, or the like as described herein above with reference to interface 150 (col. 5, lines 38-42).

In regard to claims 6 and 7, as cited above, Wergeland et al. teach the air interface between the mobile terminal and the external display device includes a Bluetooth link, it is implied that a Bluetooth chip is included in the mobile terminal and the display device.

In regard to claim 14, as cited above, Wergeland et al. teach the mobile terminal displaying the uncompressed captured image frame, and transferring the compressed image over the air interface, thus, it is implied that the mobile terminal may not be able to display the image frame in compressed format unless it is decompressed.

In regard to claims 15 and 25, as shown in Fig. 2, Wergeland et al. teach memory 220 for storing incoming data (col. 5, lines 29-34).

As per claim 26, as cited above, Wergeland et al. teach captured image frames and compressed image frames can be image and video.

In regard to claim 27, although it is not explicitly stated, the wireless communication link as taught by Wergeland et al. should inherently include an access code to recognize which

Art Unit: 2676

mobile device is in communication, and a header to establish the communication link between the mobile device and the external display in order to transfer second display data (payload).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 9, 11, 12, 17, 21, and 34 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wergeland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,792,148).

As for claims 9 and 12, as cited above, with reference to Figs. 1 and 2, since Wergeland et al. teach the interface 150 of the camera 100 includes a wireless connection (such as an infrared link, a piconet link, an optical link, an RF link, and the like) which may be the same wireless connection as the air interface 260 of the wireless mobile terminal 200 (col. 5, lines 12-42), and that the wireless mobile terminal can transmit the received data over the cellular network 320 as shown in Figs. 3A and 3B to a remote display, it is possible that the camera can transmit the first and second data to the cellular network 320, which is then transmitted to the mobile terminals 310 and 322 to be split so that the first data is display on the display of the mobile terminal and the second data is displayed on a remote display as cited above. The advantage of the modification is that the same data can be simultaneously transmitted to multiple mobile terminals.

Art Unit: 2676

In regard to claim 11, although not explicitly stated, the network as taught by Wergeland et al. should include additional information along with the first and second graphical data, for example, a device ID of the mobile terminal can be included in order for data can be appropriately transmitted.

In regard to claim 21, as cited above, Wergeland et al. teach the communication link can be a Bluetooth link.

As per claim 17 and 34, although Wegeland et al. do not explicitly disclose the display device is a television receiver, Wergeland et al. do teach transferring the second data to a remote system 330, which may be a desktop system or the like (Fig. 3B, col. 5, lines 59-62). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize the teaching of Wergeland et al. such that the second data can be displayed on a television because of its ease of use.

6. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wergeland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,792,148) in view of Narayanaswamy (U.S. Patent No. 6,611,358).

Referring to claim 8, although Wergeland et al. do not teach the display device including a means for informing the mobile terminal of a display capability of the display device, Narayanaswamy teaches polling a display device display capability before transmitting graphical information (col. 2, lines 32-45).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize the method as taught by Narayanaswamy in combination with the method as taught by Wergeland et al. so that the display device does not have to modify the received data locally (col. 2, lines 42-45).

7. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wergeland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,792,148) in view of Segal et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,765,557).

Referring to claim 18, as cited above, Wergeland et al. teach all the limitations of claim 18, except that the mobile terminal further comprises means for dividing a screen of the display into different portions, which are separately controlled.

However, Segal et al. teach a remote control device that can divide the screen of the external display device into different portions and separately control each portion (Fig. 5A).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize the method as taught by Segal et al. in combination with the method as taught by Wergeland et al. in order to allow the operator to select control function entries of the panels and menus displayed on display screen 16 while remaining visually focused on the display screen (col. 4, lines 39-44).

8. Claims 24 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wergeland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,792,148) in view of Hollstrom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,968,365).

Referring to claims 24 and 31, as cited above, Wergeland et al. teach all the limitations of claim 24 and 31, except that the communication link utilizes a wireless transmission compliant with the WAP standard.

However, as shown in Fig. 1, Hollstrom et al. teach a mobile WAP (Wireless Application Protocol) telephone having a built-in WAP browser is designed to connect via a point-to-point communication link to a stand-alone WAP server module wherein, the user of the mobile telephone 1 may operate the respective utility device 30, 40, 50 and control the functionality thereof (col. 3, lines 17-40).

Art Unit: 2676

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to utilize the method as taught by Hollstrom et al. in combination with the method as taught by Wergeland et al. in order to provide an easier way of accessing, controlling and operating electronic utility devices in a standardized and user-friendly fashion (col. 2, lines 15-17).

### *Conclusion*

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO-892 form.

Parulski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,122,526) teach a mobile phone with a radio frequency transmitter to transmit image to a remote display system.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hau H. Nguyen whose telephone number is: 571-272-7787. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-FRI from 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Hjerpe can be reached on (571) 272-7691.

The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR



Art Unit: 2676

system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

H. Nguyen

02/15/2006



RICHARD HJERPE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600